UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2919
20 April 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 April 1990, at 7.15 p.m.

President:	Mr. TADESSE	(Ethiopia)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mrs. KABA
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WATSON
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60384/A 7223V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 7.15 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

CENTRAL AMERICA: EFFORTS TOWARDS PEACE

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them a letter dated 19 April 1990 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/21257.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/21258, which contains the text of a draft resolution which has been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 653 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation was in favour of the draft resolution, above all because we considered that adopting a formal procedure by which the Council acceded to the Secretary-General's request through a resolution was the least the Council should do in dealing with a request implying a substantial alteration to the expanded mandate given by the Council to the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA).

We also voted in favour of the draft resolution because it seemed to us, as it did on 27 March, that the most pressing need was finally to end a situation of illegality imposed upon the people of Nicaragua for too many years.

At this stage we face the reality that the resolution of 27 March has not been respected, that conditions have been created on the ground that have made it impossible for ONUCA to carry out its mandate - to demobilize the elements of the so-called Nicaraguan Resistance (RN) - and that the Council found itself facing a situation to which the most rational response, in our view, was to agree to a further attempt, at this late hour, to see how the United Nations could contribute to putting an end once and for all to the illegal acts of intervention and aggression imposed upon the people of Nicaragua over the past decade.

However, we could not conceal from the Council that in casting its vote our delegation had grave reservations about some aspects of the request made to us, and I feel obliged to explain them now to the Council. They concern the substance of the decision we have taken as well as the procedure, which I feel is somewhat unusual.

The Secretary-General sent us a letter informing us of a series of agreements adopted yesterday morning in Managua, which resulted in a number of requests to the Organization, requests that the Council has just agreed to.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

My delegation understands that we have agreed to the matters referred to on page 4 of the Secretary-General's report to the Council, in two paragraphs. Paragraph (a) refers to monitoring the cease-fire and the separation of forces resulting from the withdrawal of forces of the Government of Nicaragua from the security zones and the adjoining areas. Paragraph (b) concerns collecting and destroying weapons and military equipment and material, including the uniforms of the Nicaraguan Resistance, as described in the Secretary-General's previous reports to the Council, including, I understand, the aide-mémoire distributed to us just a few days ago.

I say that because the request before us is the result of a series of agreements, making up a kind of jigsaw puzzle, which the Council has not yet had before it. As my colleagues know, I am privileged to have copies, and I should like to refer to a number of aspects of the agreements and state my country's position.

For example, the agreement establishing the cease-fire, signed by the Nicaraguan Government authorities, representatives of the Nicaraguan Resistance, Cardinal Obando and representatives of the next Government of Nicaragua, contains a number of matters on which I do not feel the Council is in a position to give its authorization; at least, I should like to express my delegation's clear reservations with regard to them.

Paragraph 10 of the agreement states:

"Authorities of the RN are authorized to communicate and move between one area and another, under ONUCA co-ordination". There is a similar provision in another agreement, relating to elements on the Atlantic coast, but there "movimiento" or movement, is replaced by "movilizacion", which can have a broader meaning in Spanish.

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We did not think that in authorizing the Secretary-General and ONUCA to carry out the tasks I have mentioned, concerning the cease-fire, separation of forces and the collection and destruction of weapons, we were committing ONUCA elements to carrying out this task, which I do not regard as clearly defined and which implies, among other things, that the Nicaraguan Resistance will continue to have an organized military structure, since the term "mandos" in Spanish has a very specific meaning to anyone who knows something of military language. Its use means that the commanders of the groups concerned will be able to communicate with one another and move around Nicaragua - in fact, through extensive areas of the country, where, as is known, their armed personnel are located. I do not know what communications, "movimientos" or "movilizaciones" of those elements the United Nations is going to co-ordinate. At the least, I should have felt happier if the Council had shown more concern to consider these matters, even though the text has not been translated from Spanish into the Council's other official languages.

Paragraph 12 of the same agreement states:

"The CIAV will transport and deliver humanitarian assistance to the troops of the RN and their families in the security zones".

I recall the clear language that the Secretary-General used in his aide-mémoire, where he referred to the seriousness implied by demobilization in an institutional sense - collective, not individual; he was correct in his understanding that this concept was different from that of the Central American Presidents at the Tela Conference, and in his understanding of its practical difficulties.

The agreement refers to troops, and troops have their commanders. Nothing could be further removed from the concept of demobilization than the permanent presence in certain areas, protected by the United Nations, of uniformed, armed troops, with their own military leadership and nation-wide co-ordination. It would

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

be immoral if the United Nations were to waste a single cent of any Member State's money or the Secretariat's resources in providing so-called humanitarian assistance to those gentlemen. I believe it would be the first time the humanitarian bodies of the system had provided humanitarian assistance to uniformed units, militarily organized and with their leadership intact. It would be a considerable departure from the practices and methods employed by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The agreements include annexes, one of which is a timetable. In point 5 we are told - in fact, we are not told, because no one has informed the Security Council - of

"The start of delivery of humanitarian aid by the CIAV to RN troops in the 'security zones'".

According to the document, the starting date for that operation was 19 April 1990, at noon. In that case, it began yesterday.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Might we not have met somewhat more urgently, yesterday? Seemingly impossible. But apparently this was taking place before the Council was informed.

There is something more serious, more disturbing than that. There is another annex, dealing with the Toncontin Agreement signed by Commander Ruben, Mr. Antonio Lacayo and Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo. It does not include the Nicaraguan Government but rather the representatives of the future Government and representatives of the contras and the Cardinal.

The third paragraph of that agreement interprets the role of ONUCA in a way that I hope is not entertained by its Commander. It suggests that a voluntary delivery of the weapons would be carried out in the presence of international organizations - ONUCA and the International Support and Verification Mission (CIAV).

But in its first preambular paragraph the resolution just adopted clearly provides for the complete demobilization of the Nicaraguan Resistance by ONUCA, not in the presence of ONUCA. That is one of the series of agreements that prompted us today to undertake this exercise.

There are also two pages - I do not know if they form part of these agreements. One contains a paragraph 10 which seemingly is a continuation of the timetable. It reads as follows:

"The Government of Nicaragua and the Nicaraguan Resistance shall meet to establish prior guarantees to be enjoyed by members of the RN. Following agreement and guarantees, the demobilization of RN forces will be carried out. Date of completion: 27 April."

Below that, in parentheses, can be read "Proposed by RN as last point in the timetable for 26 April". I do not know whether this proposal by the RN was approved in the timetable. Since we have received this in a somewhat unusual fashion it is not clear what the status of this is. But it would appear that this

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

endless story of the contras, which has gone on for so long - the story of the financing and deployment of armed groups against the Government of a sovereign Central American State - is not even going to end on 25 April, because in theory there is a possibility that somebody, however odd this may seem, may seek to impose further conditions or attempt to bring pressure to bear not upon the present Government but upon the future Government, which is to take office on 25 April, saying it is going to be necessary to discuss this matter, and the armed elements deployed in these areas in Nicaragua protected by ONUCA forces may or may not determine that these guarantees are sufficient.

Furthermore, the same idea is implicit when it refers to the stages in the demobilization process, the fulfilment of which will be determined by the willingness and ability of the new Government to take office on 25 April to meet the conditions and security safeguards required by the RN, which would represent an obligation of the Government elect.

Let us hope that these two paragraphs, these loose pieces in the jigsaw puzzle, are not part of the series of agreements reached. But I think they are quite illuminating as to the extent to which as of yesterday some of the factors directly involved in this deplorable, painful and excessively long exercise were considering the possibility of bringing the matter to an end.

Now that this resolution has been adopted we must express our conviction that the United Nations must do its utmost to ensure that this process of complete demobilization of the Nicaraguan Resistance by ONUCA is carried out within the period laid down in the first preambular paragraph of the resolution and ends on 10 June 1990. Before 7 May we shall have to review all aspects of ONUCA's operations, in accordance with operative paragraph 2 of the resolution just adopted. We hope that by then we shall have some indication of how the whole process is working.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I think, furthermore, that if anything is to be concluded from this experience, as we find ourselves approaching its possible end, it is that there needs to be real political will on the part of those who have brought this situation about - who have provoked these circumstances, providing the financing and violating international law and indeed their own national legislation over so many years - to take a real and sincere step forward to once and for all put an end to this series of violations of international law and the principles of international coexistence. If anyone is to pay to cover the costs involved in ending this criminal series of deeds carried out to keep these people in Nicaragua, it is the Government responsible for the perpetuation of this state of affairs and the insolubility of the situation up until today. I refer to the United States of America. The international community and the Members of this Organization have no obligation to assume any responsibility.

I would end by making one further comment. In these agreements we read expressions of concern and guarantees relating to the so-called members of the Nicaraguan Resistance, or the troops with their leaders. This is mentioned in the agreements: security areas are going to be set up, there are going to be movements of troops of the legitimate Government of Nicaragua to provide safeguards for these individuals. I would express concern about the guarantees, security and the right to peace and life of the people living in those areas - those, that is, who would be left subject to the whims of the only organized, armed, militarily prepared forces, the so-called elements of the Nicaraguan Resistance.

It is our hope that our Organization and its representatives in Nicaragua will act in such a fashion that in future we do not find ourselves obliged to regret any association or coexistence with new crimes or further violations of the Nicaraguan people.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation heard with satisfaction and accepted the statement of the Secretary-General in which he informed members of the Security Council of the signing, on 19 April in Managua, of agreements the implementation of which, as we understand it, will finally lead to the full demobilization of the Nicaraguan Resistance and thus put an end to this dangerous source of tension in Central America.

It is precisely from this standpoint and on this understanding of the goal and purport of the 19 April agreements that we supported the Secretary-General's proposal with regard to measures that would enable the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) to play its allotted role in this process. It is to be hoped that the 19 April agreements will be marked by the fact that the solution of the basic situation of the transitional period in Nicaragua is now entering its final stage.

The signing of these important agreements has come about only as the result of all kinds of hard work designed to create the internal and external conditions necessary to ensure the achievement of national reconciliation in Nicaragua. The Government of Nicaragua and representatives of the victorious coalition in the elections both signed a protocol on the modalities for the transfer of presidential power, as well as the Toncontin agreement on the demobilization of the contras and the declaration of Montelimar adopted by the Presidents of the five Central American countries. The essential thing is that all those documents are based on the express wish of the overwhelming majority of the Nicaraguan people for peace and harmony. We hope that the will of that people will be implemented on the basis of unconditional compliance with the 19 April agreements.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

In that connection, I should like to point out in particular the consistent and persistent efforts of the Secretary-General to promote the normalization of the situation around Nicaragua and to solve the key problems of a settlement and the demobilization of the contras. We have noted with satisfaction the conclusion, with the direct participation of ONUCA, of the demobilization operation of detachments of the Nicaraguan Resistance on Honduran territory.

At the same time, unfortunately, we are still concerned about the mass passage of armed contras into Nicaragua. That action was carried out in violation of earlier agreements; this compels us - and I speak quite frankly here - to be somewhat concerned about the sincerity of the contra leaders with regard to the agreements just concluded on 19 April. Of course, we hope that the contras will comply strictly with the demobilization agreement signed in Managua. We cannot possibly permit a situation in which the security zones that have been created should be transformed into an extensive springboard for the armed opposition in Nicaraguan territory, a kind of State within a State. The existence of these zones, as we see it, will be legitimate only within the context of the implementation of the main task of ensuring the disarming of the contras within the prescribed timetable. Otherwise, all this could not only dash hopes of national reconciliation in Nicaragua but also, in light of the United Nations current involvement in the operation, undermine the authority of the United Nations in that part of the world.

The Soviet delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on the extension of the mandate of ONUCA on the basis of the explanations of the tasks, composition and timetable for the disarmament of the contras and the financing of the operation, as laid down in the Secretary-General's statement during the Council's consultations (S/21259).

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

We are convinced that, given our concerted efforts and the political will of all parties concerned, there none the less exists a genuine possibility of promoting the process of reconciliation and its key element, the demobilization of the contras, on the basis of the agreements achieved. For our part, we shall act precisely in that spirit.

Mr. WATSON (United States of America): I had not intended to speak during this meeting of the Security Council, but I feel compelled to do so owing to some remarks made by speakers who preceded me.

First of all, I should like to express the profound thanks of my delegation for the truly heroic work of the Secretary-General and his colleagues in the United Nations, and for their energetic and creative efforts, to contribute to the search for peace in Central America. I believe that it is profoundly important to note that those efforts have been in support of agreements arrived at with great difficulty, patience and political courage by the Presidents of the five countries of Central America. We support those agreements fully, their implementation now, and the efforts of the Secretary-General to contribute to that process.

I must take exception at the assertion of the representative of Cuba that somehow my country is apparently responsible for all of the ills that have befallen Nicaragua. No less than any other Government, mine regrets the difficulties the Nicaraguans have suffered. But now, in a dramatic demonstration of civic pride and nationalism, Nicaraguans themselves have determined their future by democratic means. The parties in Nicaragua have come to an agreement by which they expect to arrive at internal peace, not something imposed on them by outsiders but something which they have arrived at and which we enthusiastically support.

(Mr. Watson, United States)

Needless to say, we support the United Nations efforts to participate in that process, as requested of us by the Secretary-General. We hope that other conflicts in Central America can also be resolved quickly between the parties in the respective countries and that all external parties will contribute to peaceful settlements of those disputes and not to war, conflict and suffering.

In that regard, we laud the efforts of the Secretary-General and his colleaques in seeking to facilitate discussions that will lead to peace in El Salvador, and we hope that all the members of the Security Council and all other nations will support those efforts as enthusiastically as we are supporting his efforts to contribute to peace in Nicaragua.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): It is late in the day, so I will not take up much more of the Council's time. I merely wish to say that I absolutely agree with Ambassador Watson with respect to his recognition of the enormous efforts made by the Secretary-General and the Secretariat to attempt to bring peace to Central America, including the efforts being made to assist the parties involved in the conflict in El Salvador to move forward to negotiation.

However, I am not at all in agreement with him - and, indeed, I think very few are - when he attempts to disregard his Government's responsibility in the tragedy the people of Nicaragua have experienced and are still experiencing. The mass of documentation available in this country - in its Congress and its courts - at the Court in The Hague and in General Assembly records makes it, it seems to me, unnecessary now, at this hour in the evening, to explain why his Government bears sole responsibility for this tragedy.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2920
3 May 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 3 May 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

President:	Mr. TORNUDD	(Finland)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. DING Yuanhong
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Ethiopia	Mr. HAGOSS
	France	Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60422/A 7521V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of May, I should like to take this opportunity first to pay a tribute, on behalf of the Council, to Mr. Tesfaye Tadesse, Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of April. I am sure that I speak for all members of the Council in expressing our appreciation to Ambassador Tadesse for the friendliness and cordiality with which he accomplished his duties last month, and I am personally grateful to him for his kind support and assistance, particularly in connection with the transition of the presidency from Ethiopia to Finland.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 12 FEBRUARY 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21139)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber. I invite the representative of Palestine to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Noor (Afghanistan), Mr. Bendjama (Algeria), Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Menon (India), Mr. Sutresna (Indonesia), Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq), Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Rahhali (Morocco), Mr. Vigil (Nicaragua), Mr. Umer (Pakistan), Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar), Mr. Al-Kahtany (Saudi Arabia), Mrs. Diallo (Senegal), Mr. Awad (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Nyakyi (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Sallam (Yemen) and Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Greece and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zepos (Greece) and Mr. Aksin (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Mr. MUNTEANU (Romania) (interpretation from French): The Romanian delegation is delighted to see you, Sir, presiding over the work of the Security Council during the month of May. I offer you my congratulations and very best wishes for success in the performance of your lofty functions.

I wish to take this opportunity to express to Ambassador Tadesse our great admiration for the brilliance with which he guided our consultations and meetings last month.

I should like to extend my warm thanks to all representatives who, in the course of the debate, have congratulated Romania on its election to membership of the Security Council.

I want to make it clear from the very start that the members of the Council, and the other Members of the Organization as well, will find in the free Romania of today an active and constructive partner in our common effort to build relations among all States in a way entirely in keeping with the goals and principles of the United Nations.

The Security Council is once again called upon to take up the situation in the occupied Arab territories. The reasons for this are clear. On the one hand, earlier Security Council and the General Assembly decisions have not been fully respected, and this has led to a further deterioration of the dangerous situation in the occupied Arab territories; and, on the other, the broader question of a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East remains a goal whose realization is ever more urgent.

The terms of the request addressed to the Security Council by the Soviet Union are very clear. This request is in response to the continued settlement of immigrants in the occupied Arab territories, in particular to the trend towards stepping up this process. It is also in keeping with the legitimate concerns and

(Mr. Munteanu, Romania)

anxiety of the Palestinian people, for whom the settling of immigrants in the territories occupied following the 1967 war is inadmissible. The purpose of the Soviet request and, consequently, of the current debate is to put an end to the policy of settling immigrants on the West Bank, in Gaza and in East Jerusalem, so as to ensure scrupulous respect for the norms of international law governing the status of territories acquired by force and to promote progress towards a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

While recognizing the right of free movement contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and welcoming the new attitude of the Soviet Government in this regard, the Romanian delegation believes that the exercise of this right is not of a univocal nature, and that, at the same time, it must not be prejudicial to the interests of any people. The Security Council must reaffirm the terms of this moral and political equation with regard to the Middle East situation and call for strict respect for the international norms governing this problem.

The Security Council is thus called upon to take a clear-cut position on this problem. As has been stressed in this debate, the occupied Arab territories occupied following the 1967 war, including the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem, remain subject to the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Pursuant to this Convention, the occupying Power is bound to prohibit acts likely to modify the demographic structure of occupied territories. If violations of the provisions of this document are committed, the Security Council, by virtue of the responsibilities vested in it, has the duty of bringing about a cessation of such violations.

(Mr. Munteanu, Romania)

It is not only legal considerations that dictate an immediate halt to the settlement of immigrants in the occupied Arab territories. That measure is essential if the efforts aimed at establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East as soon as possible are to be successful. There can be no doubt that such a peace settlement would be in keeping with the fundamental immediate and, above all, long-term interests of all peoples of the region, and indeed of the international community as a whole.

The bases for such a settlement are clearly defined in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and other United Nations decisions. They include the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territories occupied following the 1967 war, the exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination, and ensuring and guaranteeing the right of all parties to the conflict to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from the threat or use of force.

Those fundamental elements of any future peace settlement in the Middle East take into account the legitimate interests of all parties to the conflict and are based on the cardinal principles of international law. That is why they are capable of ensuring the viability and durability of the edifice of peace that must be built in the Middle East.

For 23 years now, the establishment of peace in that region has always been an urgent goal. But the urgency has never been so great as it is today. The main directions of world developments in political, economic and strategic terms suggest that the Middle East cannot and must not remain an island of confrontation in a world that is becoming ever more convinced that true national interests are no longer served by force.

(Mr. Munteanu, Romania)

In military terms, however, there remains an element that only enhances the urgency of a peace settlement in the region. I am referring to the development of military technologies that make a new war in the Middle East unthinkable.

In the Romanian Government's view, the Security Council is duty bound to accelerate by its actions the peace process in the Middle East. An important step in that direction would be for it to call on Israel to honour its international obligations and to put an end to the settlement of immigrants in the occupied Arab territories. Other steps could be considered subsequently with a view to supporting more actively and effectively efforts to initiate a dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis and to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East.

My delegation believes that the decision to be taken by the Security Council at the conclusion of this debate must contribute to the achievement of those vital objectives for all the peoples of the Middle East and for international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Romania for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Greece. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ZEPOS (Greece): I wish at the outset to extend to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, and to assure you of our confidence that your well-known diplomatic skills and leadership will guarantee the successful work of the Council. I wish equally to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Ethiopia, Ambassador Tadesse, for having successfully and with great skill conducted the work of the Council during the previous month.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

As this is the first time I have spoken in the Council this year, I take this opportunity to congratulate most sincerely its new members - Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania and Zaire. I wish also to pay a tribute to the members who retired at the end of last year - Algeria, Brazil, Senegal, Nepal and Yugoslavia - for their valuable contribution, alongside the other members of the Council, in promoting the purposes of the United Nations at a period of most notable developments, among which the achievement of the independence of Namibia deserves special mention.

The persistence of Israel in continuing the practice of settling its population and new immigrants in occupied Arab territories, including East Jerusalem, constitutes one of the most serious aspects of the Middle East problem, which is perpetuating the Arab-Israeli conflict and preventing a just and viable solution to the question of Palestine. Peace and security have for decades been in jeopardy in the troubled region of the Middle East. Greece, not only because of its proximity to that region but also because of its steadfast commitment to safeguarding the principles and purposes of the United Nations, cannot fail to reiterate its concern at the continuation of those unacceptable practices.

The persistence of Israel in occupying those territories since 1967 remains the main obstacle to a solution based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The continuation of the illegal practice of attempting to establish settlers in the occupied territories underlines even further the need to reach a lasting solution by peaceful means. My Government believes that the question of Palestine can be solved by convening an international peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations. All the parties directly interested could participate in such a process, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

My Government has on many occasions made it clear that it condemns Israeli settlement practices in the occupied territories. They constitute a flagrant violation of international law. As a party to the Fourth Geneva Convention, Greece has not failed to specify that the Convention also applies to all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including East Jerusalem. Israel, therefore, also being a party to the Convention, is called upon to respect it in all its terms and provisions.

As the debate on the continuation of the illegal settlements by Israel has already reached an advanced stage, I do not wish to dwell on all aspects of the problem, further aggravated by the recent arrival of Soviet Jews in the occupied territories. I wish at this juncture to convey the deep concern and regret of the Greek Government at events that recently took place in the Christian Quarter of East Jerusalem, and which it has also not failed to condemn. On 11 April, in the wake of the continuing illegal practice perpetrated by Israel to which I have already referred, settlers occupied the St. John Hospice, owned by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and situated in the heart of the Christian Quarter of the Old City. My Government reacted immediately with strong *démarches* to the Israeli Government, asking in no uncertain terms for the immediate eviction of the settlers. It also demanded that the rights and privileges of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem be respected in this regard.

There has been widespread international reaction to this most recent relapse into illegal practices by Israel. Among such reactions, it would be pertinent to refer to a statement made on behalf of the Secretary-General to the effect that he was following with deep concern developments in the Christian Quarter of Jerusalem's Old City, and further, that he opposes all settlement activity in the

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

territories occupied by Israel since 1967 and was particularly disturbed to learn of the involvement of some Israeli officials in the financial transactions that led to the move of Jewish settlers to the Christian Quarter. I do not have to add anything to that very eloquent and clear view held by the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

I wish to conclude with the following remark: Recently we have witnessed some important developments in the Middle East, namely efforts to initiate an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue. The Greek Government fully supports these efforts as a first step towards a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its core, the Palestinian problem, through peaceful means in the framework of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations. My Government hopes that no further obstacles will be raised to obstruct the initiation of such a dialogue.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Greece for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May and express our full confidence that you will carry out your task with success. I also want to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Tadesse of Ethiopia, for the skilful way in which he conducted the Council's deliberations in April.

Israel's policy of establishing settlements in occupied Arab territories has been a continuous cause of concern for Turkey. Many resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly have called for an end to Israel's disregard of its basic international obligations. There have been numerous appeals for full respect for the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. It is a matter of regret that those appeals have gone unheeded.

Since 1967 we have witnessed deliberate and systematic attempts to modify the demographic structure of the occupied Arab territories in Jerusalem, the West Bank

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

and Gaza, as well as in the Golan. These activities have contributed significantly to the instability of a region that is already potentially explosive. Now there is this additional element of Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union who are being encouraged to settle in the occupied Arab territories. In conjunction with provocative statements being made on long-term ambitions with respect to occupied lands, this has resulted in increased tension and dashed hopes for early peace talks.

My delegation associates itself with all those previous speakers who called for an immediate end to Israel's illegal actions. Turkey has made its position on this matter very clear. It will be recalled that my country was among the sponsors of a draft resolution at the recent meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva demanding an end to the settlement of Jewish immigrants in occupied Arab territories. We are convinced that one of the basic conditions for reaching a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East is the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab lands, including Jerusalem, that have been occupied since 1967. The return of the occupied lands to their owners is a prerequisite for peace.

Before this latest issue of Jewish settlements sparked renewed international concern, positive attempts were under way for advancing the peace process. Just as we appeared to be approaching a dialogue between the representatives of Palestine and of Israel, we fear that the latest events have set back the peace efforts.

After the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) made the historic move of accepting Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), together with its denunciation of terrorism and, most important, its acceptance of the right of Israel to exist, conditions improved dramatically for achieving a settlement in the Middle East. The Palestinian position, based on realism and conciliation, can be the important first step leading to meaningful negotiations and, ultimately,

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

peace. Unfortunately, those moves have not been reciprocated with vision and generosity. Instead, we have witnessed a further intensification of oppressive measures against the Palestinian people, a growing disregard for that people's human rights, and a lack of good faith in seeking a common understanding with a view to beginning a dialogue. The increase in the settlement of immigrants in the occupied territories casts grave doubt on Israel's sincerity and intentions at this critical juncture.

The international community stands united in its belief that the solution to the question of the Middle East must be based on justice, the right to self-determination and the right of all States in the region to exist in peace behind recognized and secure borders, and that this should be achieved through the participation of all interested parties in negotiations conducted in good faith within the framework of an international peace conference. Turkey firmly supports that position and strongly opposes any practice which might hinder the pursuit of that process.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Palestine, on whom I now call.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine): It is with great satisfaction and pleasure that we see the representative of the friendly country and the friendly people of Finland presiding over the Security Council's deliberations during the month of May. We hope that before the end of the month the Council, under your stewardship, Sir, will somehow reach some sort of accommodation which will bring peace to my part of the world, namely Palestine.

We should like also to put on record our appreciation for the diligence of your predecessor, the representative of Ethiopia.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

The Council has been dealing with this issue for decades. But what precisely the Council has been dealing with lately is the question of immigration and settlement, and the results of that policy and practice by the occupying Power, Israel.

We were informed a couple of days ago, on 1 May, by the head of the Jewish Agency, Mr. Simcha Dinitz, that the number of Jewish immigrants to Israel during April hit a new record. He added that 30,000 Soviet emigrants have come to Israel since January. The Israeli press has reported that the immigration budget will be increased to accommodate 120,000 immigrants in the year 1990. In the past, appropriations have been made on the basis of 40,000 immigrants a year. Now, the immigration budget will have to be reviewed and amended on a monthly basis.

Naturally, as was stated here by my Foreign Minister, we agree that the right to depart is a right of individuals. But we had expected that the right to arrive at a desired destination would be reciprocated. Unfortunately, it was not.

Concurrent with this policy of opening up the gates, it was inevitable that something would take place: homes, houses, areas would be prepared to receive the immigrants, whether coming from the Soviet Union or from any other place.

We were told on 1 May that the current caretaker Government in Israel - and since it is a caretaker Government, who cares?, it can do whatever it likes - has already authorized the implementation of a plan to establish 14 new settlements in the occupied territories.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

Those settlements are mostly in the occupied Palestinian territory in the West Bank, but some are in Gaza.

Israeli television reported yesterday that Jewish settlers will begin moving into Dogit, a recently established Gaza Strip Jewish settlement, in about three weeks. We were also told of a statement by Michael Dekel, now the Prime Minister's adviser on settlement affairs. We have some memories of him, for he used to be the deputy of the Defence Minister who proposed and defended a policy of transfer of the non-Jewish population from Israel into the wilderness across the river. We learn that he had already stated that there would be a rush to establish two new settlements in the West Bank. Those two new settlements will be Raba and Rehan B.

Those things are happening while the Council is deliberating, trying to seek a way out and to bring peace. Those settlements could not have been established if they were not also to be provided for financially. We learn that the United States Government has no objection to meeting a request for a $400 million housing loan, but that it needs a guarantee that the loan will not be used to establish settlements in the territories occupied since 1967. To do him justice, I should add that President Bush has made it very clear that the West Bank and East Jerusalem are part of those occupied territories. But that is in reference to new settlements and the $400 million. With a little bit of playing with the books, the $400 million could be used to help housing on the territories of Israel, and the funds would then come from the Ministry of Defence, say, to establish "military outposts" in the occupied territory. Then there would be no way to find out exactly how those funds were used, misused or maliciously used. The supply of $400 million per se is encouragement to the Government of Israel to establish more settlements.

Israel's reply, particularly with the caretaker Government, has always been that no one can question the right of Jews to settle wherever they want in the land

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

of Israel. But I do not know exactly what it means, because it has never told us what the borders of that State are.

All of that seems to be common knowledge. What prompted an immediate request that the Council should continue considering the situation was the alarming news that Israeli troops have today confined 120,000 Palestinians to their homes and sealed off half the occupied West Bank to prevent violence at a so-called religious seminary established by Israeli settlers at a site in Nablus. The site is holy to Moslems and Jews, and I am sure it will be equally holy to the Christians.

The issue is that the place where the Jews want to establish a new school and put the Torah scrolls is the site of the biblical patriarch Joseph. Joseph, like Abraham, belongs to everybody. Why choose these moments of tension to set up a school there and also to supply more room to establish a kitchen, as it is said, and perhaps have a dormitory?

A great deal of money has come for the scroll. Unfortunately, it is reported, the money came from the British Jews. Why on earth should anybody give money to establish a school in the occupied territory to start with? We welcome the establishment of schools, even if they are biblical schools, but why should the British Jews be permitted to use British funds to establish a school in the occupied territory? As one Arab in Nablus said, "We all know how the settlements begin. They begin with a Torah scroll and if you don't look closely suddenly there is a settlement there."

Prime Minister Shamir is forming the rightist Government, as we all know. That Government is expected to be free of the restraints on settlements imposed by the former Labour Party Coalition.

What we should really be focusing on is this: the head of the seminary or biblical school to be established in Nablus, a certain Rabbi Yitzak Ginsburg said "The establishment of a seminary is no provocation. Why should it be a provocation

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

to live in your own home?" Here he comes and settles in Nablus, possibly in a house of an Arab and asks "Why should it be a provocation to live in your own home?"

Let us go more closely into what is happening in Nablus today. According to Israeli security officials, the seminary's students are the nucleus of an anti-Arab underground group. Four of them, aged 24 to 39, were charged with killing a teenage girl during a rampage through an Arab village a year ago. Here are a group of criminals saying they are seminarians and want to establish themselves there. We still recall what happened in the old city of Jerusalem a few years ago.

That same Rabbi Ginsburg said on Israeli radio - and I should like the Council to listen to this carefully -

"It must be recognized that Jewish blood and the blood of the non-Jew are not the same."

Could there be anything more racist in that movement? Yet we know that the process of establishing more settlements is under way.

We have approached you, Sir, as President of the Council, and your predecessor with a number of memoranda about the affairs, incidents or acts of aggression that took place in Jerusalem during Holy Week. What happened in Holy Week was maliciously orchestrated to provoke a situation which we all tried to avoid and prevent. The statement that the St. John Hospice is not a church is correct; it is not. Nobody had ever claimed that it was a church. It is not a religious place, but it is the property of the Patriarchate, of the church trust. One cannot expect less from an occupying Power than that it shall prevent clashes, fist-fighting. To attack the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who, it was claimed, fell down as a result of tear-gas inhalation, is the limit.

More than that, we are made to believe that when a particular monk removed paper bearing the Star of David which had been placed there to cover the cross he was accused of being anti-Semite or anti-Jew.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

The Israeli Minister-without-Portfolio, Avner Sciaki, who was acting as Minister of Religious Affairs, issued a sharp statement in reaction to the announcement by the heads of the Christian churches in which, according to The Jerusalem Post, he called the threatened action of the churches:

> "baseless, capricious and overly emotional," [and claimed that Jews had a] "natural, ethical and legal right to live in all parts of Jerusalem. ... threats from outside sources against the presence of Jews in East Jerusalem are completely intolerable, as this constitutes discrimination against Jews."

Thus, we now are being made to realize that self-defence is viewed as being anti-Jewish or anti-Semitic.

Naturally, we are all aware that the Christian churches had decided that on Friday, 27 April, all religious shrines would be closed in protest of the Israeli practices and that church bells would ring the funeral toll on that day. Jointly with the Christian churches we understand that the Moslem religious leaders decided to close the Mosque in Jerusalem on that day as well. Something that we should remember is that the Christian churches had not closed or shut their gates for the past 800 years, and, as far as we know, the Mosque was never closed. Yet, as a result of and in protest against Israeli practices, that is exactly what happened.

We all know - and we thank His Holiness the Holy Father for it - of the statement he issued on 30 April, in which he said:

> "I want to invite you now to be, together with me, spiritually close to our brothers in East Jerusalem, especially those responsible for the venerable Christian churches. The grave incidents that have occurred recently in the Holy City and that led to the sorrowful decision to close holy places temporarily, and in particular the Basilica of the Holy Sepulchre, are also for me a cause of suffering and profound concern."

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

Our struggle in Palestine is only a struggle to attain our right to self-determination and to exercise it and to terminate the Israeli occupation. There is unanimity in the Council that that occupation is illegal, and consequently anything or any move taken as a result of that occupation is illegal. We have never thought that this would be a holy war wherein the Jewish religious seminarists would come and occupy the Christian places.

Perhaps at this juncture it would be worthwhile recalling what the Security Council has considered about Jerusalem and its fate. We recall that in Security Council resolution 252 (1968) the Council considered that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status.

Again, in resolution 478 (1980) of 20 August 1980, the Council censured in the strongest terms the enactment by Israel of the "basic law" in Jerusalem and the refusal to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions. In the same resolution the Council determined that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which have altered or purport to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, and in particular the recent "basic law" on Jerusalem, are null and void and must be rescinded forthwith.

Perhaps at this juncture we might recall the position of the Government of the United States. In 1969 Ambassador Charles Yost stated:

> "The expropriation or confiscation of land, the construction of housing on such land, the demolition or confiscation of buildings, including those having historic or religious significance, and the application of Israeli law to occupied portions of the city are detrimental to our common interests in the city." (Official Records of the Security Council, 1483rd meeting, para. 97)

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

In 1971 the Security Council heard the then-Ambassador of the United States and current President of the United States. At that meeting Ambassador Bush stated:

> "We regret Israel's failure to acknowledge its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention as well as its actions which are contrary to the letter and spirit of this Convention. We are distressed that the actions of Israel in the occupied portion of Jerusalem give rise to understandable concern that the eventual disposition of the occupied section of Jerusalem may be prejudiced." (Official Records of the Security Council, 1582nd meeting, para. 354)

Ambassador Bush went on to say that:

> "All of us understand, as I indicated earlier in these remarks, that Jerusalem has a very special place in the Judaic tradition, one which has a great meaning for Jews throughout the world. At the same time Jerusalem holds a special place in the hearts of many millions of Christians and Moslems throughout the world. ... An Israeli occupation policy made up of unilaterally determined practices cannot help promote a just and lasting peace any more than that cause was served by the status quo in Jerusalem prior to June 1967." (Ibid., para. 355)

So we can understand that the position recently stated by His Excellency the President of the United States shows that he maintains a consistent approach on the future and destiny of Jerusalem. And we can, of course, realize that that position is fully consistent with - and, indeed, required by - Article 1 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which requires the United States Government not only to respect but also "to ensure respect for" the terms of that Convention by other parties, such as Israel, in all circumstances. Thus, we can see that on the question of Jerusalem there is unanimity. In this case, I would again underline the position of the United States, as stated.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

Now, on this issue one would have to go back to the Fourth Geneva Convention, which is the only legal premise on which Israel can deal with that part of Jerusalem. We are dealing in particular with Article 47, which reads:

> "Protected persons who are in occupied territory shall not be deprived, in any case or in any manner whatsoever, of the benefits of the present Convention by any change introduced, as the result of the occupation of a territory, into the institutions or government of the said territory, nor by any agreement concluded between the authorities of the occupied territories and the Occupying Power, nor by any annexation by the latter of the whole or part of the occupied territory."

I mention this simply to comment that no action has been taken by the Council - or, with all due respect, by His Excellency the Secretary-General - while awaiting the decision of Israel's High Court in this regard. Yet Israel's High Court's decision is not relevant in this case. The area is an occupied area, and it is governed by the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention, not by a lease or an agreement between two parties.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

Then, speaking about the behaviour of the Israeli forces of occupation, one can still recall the responsibilities of the international community to ensure respect for the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Article 27 makes it very clear that persons under occupation

"shall at all times be humanely treated, and shall be protected, especially against all acts of violence or threats thereof and against insults and public curiosity."

So we have to focus on the basics for this situation. It is to be governed only by the Fourth Geneva Convention and not by any other consideration. We appreciate and wish to thank the Secretary-General for the statement attributed to him on 24 April.

Concerning behaviour, we are also concerned over what happened on the Islamic feast of Eid Al-Fitr. On 26 April, Israeli soldiers shot and killed at least three Palestinians in the Jabalya refugee camp in Gaza. According to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), an additional 215 men, women and children were injured, of whom 181 were from the Jabalya refugee camp.

What really happened in the Jabalya refugee camp? On 26 April, on the occasion of the Eid Al-Fitr feast, after the dawn prayer, local residents proceeded to the Jabalya cemetery, as well as private houses, in order to pay their respects to the dead. We have a tradition that on such days all our people go to the cemetery and remember our dead in prayers.

During the course of the processions, local residents encountered a military force. Israeli soldiers fired tear-gas canisters into the crowd without prior warnings. Stones were then thrown by the local residents.

Shortly afterwards, reinforcements were called in by the army, including armoured personnel carriers, border police jeeps and helicopters. A range of

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

measures were used in the ensuing confrontation, including the use of live and plastic ammunition, rubber-coated metal marbles, tear gas fired from helicopters in huge quantities and widespread severe beatings.

In one hospital alone, the Ahli Hospital, 96 injured local residents were treated.

The Israeli army had ample opportunity to prepare for what transpired at the Jabalya refugee camp on 26 April. The Commander of the Southern Region, a certain Matan Wilnai, was quoted in the Israeli daily Ha'aretz of 27 April as saying:

"We expected that a matter of this sort would happen. The quiet was suspicious in our eyes. In the end it exploded".

So it can be understood why we believe that the international community is called upon to take its obligation seriously under Article 1 of the Fourth Geneva Convention to ensure that Israel, the occupying Power, respect the terms of the Convention. I am afraid that I have to make it clear here that our people under occupation believe that the signatories to the Convention have so far failed to provide effective protection to the residents of the occupied territory. Our people demand that an effective United Nations presence should be established that will enable it to monitor at close range events such as that which occurred in the Jabalya refugee camp. Our people demand that the international community urge the Israeli authorities to guarantee the monitors of local and international human rights access to areas where human rights violations are suspected to have occurred or are occurring.

I wonder whether the Security Council will seriously consider such a move or wait a couple of weeks before taking action. Naturally we know that the Secretary-General came out immediately, on 26 April, with a statement in which he stated that he was deeply disturbed by reports that three Palestinians were killed

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

and scores wounded by Israeli troops. He went on to say that those acts of violence, which took place on the first day of the Muslim feast of Eid Al-Fitr and occurred shortly after the incidents during the Holy Week in the Christian Quarter of Jerusalem's Old City, showed a regrettable disregard for the sensitivities surrounding the holiest days of the Muslim and Christian calendars.

One wonders what the Security Council would be in a position to do. We believe all members of the Security Council are High Contracting Parties to the Fourth Geneva Convention. They are called upon and are legally obligated to ensure respect for the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention. We believe and our people demand that the Council should move in that direction. Would the Council move in that direction? Or would the Council still think, "Let us wait and see if there is a Government in Israel"? I think this is something that is dragging the Security Council and the international community.

The current Prime Minister of the caretaker Government tells us very clearly that "With all due respect, I could not care less about what Mr. Baker says. I decide." International obligations mean nothing to him, he says, because this is the land of the Jews and they will settle wherever they want; and if we go into further detail we know that instructions to the army of occupation have been revived: "Break their bones". What on earth would the Security Council be prepared to do, when it can invoke the powers vested in it by the Charter? Naturally the Council has proved it can be effective in a number of cases, but what prevents the Council from taking any action in this particular case?

I need not use too much imagination. The Council has had before it a draft text that has been going around for weeks now, and we really do not know whether it will ever be put to a vote here. We hope that, as a result of the most recent Israeli reaction to the call of the international community and the international

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

community's support for the peace initiative presented by the National Council of the Palestinian people, there will be an effective response.

We believe that the Security Council, represented by its individual members, should assume its responsibility and address the issue.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Palestine for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset of the brief statement I intend to make I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May. Your friendly country is known for its constructive role on the international scene and for its defence of international legitimacy and the rule of law. Your personal qualities in terms of diplomatic skills and experience are well-known to us all.

I should like to express to Ambassador Tadesse of Ethiopia our gratitude for the skill and wisdom with which he guided the deliberations of the Council during the past month.

Mr. President, you have convened the Security Council today to consider the recent developments in the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories, even before the Council concludes its current consultations on the draft resolution before it regarding the settlement by Israel of immigrants in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem. The representative of Palestine has reported to the Council on these alarming developments and I therefore need not expand on his statement.

If we can draw some significant conclusions from the convening of this meeting, the first is that because of these very developments the Middle East region has not yet begun to enjoy the spirit of freedom, peace, conciliation and dialogue which have become widespread in all regions and continents of the world. Such a conclusion has several implications, both in the short and in the longer term.

The second significant conclusion is that the events in the Middle East, particularly with regard to the question of Palestine, the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict, have a constant bearing on the international scene because of their potential consequences, which threaten the security and stability of the region and hence international peace and security as a whole.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

The third significant conclusion, which adds further to the gravity of the first two, is that the practices of Israel as a member of the international community reflect a total disregard for the rules of international law, in the absence of which the world would in all likelihood drift towards anarchy and disintegration.

Security Council and General Assembly records contain a considerable body of resolutions condemning and denouncing Israeli practices in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. These resolutions were adopted with regard to a series of events, the most important of which is the persistence of occupation of Arab territories and the non-compliance by Israel with the rules of international law governing its status as an occupying Power. They also condemn the many arbitrary measures taken by Israel against the Palestinian uprising and the Palestinian people, which is languishing under the occupation.

While we are considering the substance of a draft resolution on the settlement of immigrants in Israel and in the occupied Palestinian territories, including occupied Jerusalem - which is contrary to the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War prohibiting the transfer or partial transfer by the occupying Power of its population to occupied territories - Israel continues to pursue its policy aimed at changing the demographic nature of the Palestinian territories by expanding the existing settlements and building new ones.

Egypt views, with grave concern, these practices as well as the policies being pursued by some quarters in Israel to expand and give momentum to the Israeli settlement activity in the occupied Palestinian territories.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Egypt holds firmly and indisputably that these measures are illegal and inadmissible, in particular those recent measures that proclaimed the establishment of new settlements in the occupied territories, including Ged in the Gaza Strip and Alon on the West Bank. These measures uncovered trends that Egypt has consistently warned against and continues to warn against, as they jeopardize and complicate every serious effort towards a peaceful settlement of the Palestine question and of the entire situation in the Middle East.

Egypt most strongly condemns the acquisition by force of premises owned by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem, the violence employed against Patriarch Theodorus and the Israeli Government's role in this action. Such an action infringes on the special religious status of the city and violates its sacred places. It has been condemned by various countries and religious institutions throughout the world for running counter to Israel's obligations under the Geneva Conventions and Security Council resolutions. Undoubtedly, the statement issued by His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, carries a special significance in this connection.

I should like to take this opportunity to stress that the international community has repeatedly emphasized that the status of the Arab city of Al Quds Al Sharif must not be violated or unilaterally modified. By the same token, rules of international law should be scrupulously observed, as should United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 267 (1969) and 465 (1980), which consider East Jerusalem an integral part of the occupied Arab territories. This continues to be the firm position of the Government of Egypt, as of other Governments, and this policy is unalterable.

I should like to avail myself of this emergency special meeting to call on Israel to stay its hand in its repression and violence against the Palestinian

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

people in the occupied territories, against the Palestinian cities, villages and refugee camps.

History has demonstrated that violence only begets more violence and tension. The valiant Palestinian uprising has shown, in no uncertain terms, that Palestinians will not give in to the overwhelming might of the occupying Power, no matter how violent it becomes. The road to freedom is a long one, in which everyone vies to make more sacrifices. The Palestinian people is no less determined than any other people to continue its struggle until it attains its inalienable national rights, including that to self-determination.

Egypt trusts that all States that believe in peace and its inevitability, and that all peoples, and political movements in Israel itself and throughout the world, will be firmly opposed to these measures and practices and will not countenance the ensuing results, considering them illegal and without any right or obligation whatsoever, except in regard to the need to reverse them and to return to the rule of law. In this connection, we call on the Security Council to ensure full respect for all the provisions and articles of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which it is our common responsibility to uphold in keeping with the first article of the Convention.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

The measures taken by Israel are totally lacking in legal authority and in no way consonant with the principles of human rights. They do not contribute to a solution of the current problems in the Middle East. Quite the contrary, they further complicate those issues. In our view, they run counter to peace and are based on norms and principles that created negative conditions in the past, inasmuch as they are opposed to the adoption of a positive attitude towards a future governed by co-operation, peaceful coexistence, international legitimacy and the rule of law.

The desired negotiated settlement and the elimination of the multitude of problems in the region will be attained only by adopting an open, far-sighted and futuristic approach - far removed from obduracy - that takes duly into account the fact that the rights and interests of all parties should be dealt with on an equal footing. This approach must also recognize that there can be no peace or stability based on a solution that takes into consideration the arguments and interests of one party only. A peace stemming from such a premise would merely be a temporary, fragile peace that would not lay the foundations for stability but would lead to tensions and explosion.

Egypt continues to hope that there will be speedy movement towards peace, and towards dialogue, which is the language of the age, and calls on Israel to put an end to its unsound policies in the occupied territories as well as to its illegal practices therein.

Israel's refusal to negotiate with the Palestinians, to observe the Geneva Conventions and to recognize the Palestinian right to self-determination following the Palestinians' recognition of Israel's right to exist are three "No's" that constitute, in general, a regrettable stance. Israel's position calls for one stand by the international community and warrants the unanimous adoption of a

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Security Council resolution - an objective and a decisive resolution commensurate with the issue before it.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further speakers on my list. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will be fixed in consultation with the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2921
4 May 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 4 May 1990, at 4 p.m.

President:	Mr. TORNUDD	(Finland)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. WANG Guangya
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ALFI
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	France	Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WATSON
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60428/A 7535V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

CENTRAL AMERICA: EFFORTS TOWARDS PEACE

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (S/21274 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Group on Central America, contained in documents S/21274 and Add.1.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/21286, which contains the text of a draft resolution which has been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 654 (1990).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2922
23 May 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 23 May 1990, at 9.10 p.m.

President:	Mr. TORNUDD	(Finland)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LU Yongshou
	Colombia	Mrs. CASTAÑO
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	France	Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. GHAZZALI
	Romania	Mr. MICU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ALFI
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60475/A 7672V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 9.10 p.m.

CONGRATULATIONS TO YEMEN

The PRESIDENT: By a note verbale dated 21 May 1990, document A/44/946, the Secretary-General communicated to the principal organs a note from the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Yemen Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen concerning the formation yesterday, 22 May 1990, of a single sovereign State called the "Republic of Yemen". I should like to express, on behalf of the Council, congratulations and best wishes to the Republic of Yemen on its unification.

EXPRESSION OF WELCOME

The PRESIDENT: I should like to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the new Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Yuliy Vorontsov, to whom, on behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome. We look forward to co-operating with him in our work.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

CENTRAL AMERICA: EFFORTS TOWARDS PEACE

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The members of the Security Council recall that the Council, in conformity with its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has supported the Central American peace process from the outset. This has resulted in its decision to set up a United

(The President)

Nations Observer Group for Central America (ONUCA), whose mandate it subsequently enlarged and reaffirmed on two occasions.

"They also recall the Council's decision in resolution 654 (1990) to extend ONUCA's mandate until 7 November 1990 on the understanding that ONUCA's tasks of monitoring the cease-fire and separation of forces in Nicaragua and demobilizing members of the resistance would lapse with the completion of the demobilization process not later than 10 June 1990.

"The members of the Security Council, taking note of the report of the Secretary-General and fully supporting his efforts, express their concern at the slow pace of the demobilization process during its first two weeks. It is clear that the process must be accelerated if the deadline of 10 June set for its completion is to be met.

"In light of the foregoing, the members of the Security Council call on the resistance to meet fully and urgently the commitments it made in agreeing to demobilize. They also support the Government of Nicaragua in its efforts to facilitate, by taking the necessary steps, timely demobilization and urge it to continue such efforts. The members of the Council also call on all others with influence in this matter to take action to ensure that demobilization now proceeds in accordance with the agremeents entered into by the Nicaraguan parties, and in particular to ensure that the 10 June deadline is respected.

"The members of the Council request the Secretary-General through a senior representative to continue to observe the situation on the ground firsthand and to report to the Council by 4 June.

"The members of the Security Council request the Secretary-General to convey the Council's position to the five Central American Presidents.

(The President)

"They also request the Secretary-General to convey the Council's concerns about the situation described above to the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States (OAS), who shares responsibilities with the Secretary-General of the United Nations as regards the operations of the International Verification and Follow-Up Commission (CIAV)."

That statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.